

that "peace and quietness" for which the Church so persistently prays. And then religion must be deep-seated. The world points the finger of scorn at so many hypocrites who make an outward show of their religion; and the Master Himself has recommended private and secret devotions, so that many come to the conclusion that private devotion is better and all-sufficient; and united prayer is done away with. The same sort of reasoning affects attendance at public worship. But in union there is strength; and there is spiritual strength in a united household. As the unit of the individual needs religion, so does the unit of the family, as such; so also does the unit of the Church. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," holds true not merely of the larger assembly of the Church, but also of the gathering together of the members of the household for the purification and strength of the home. The spiritual loss in the family reflects itself in the Church and reacts upon the spiritual life of the individual. And again we assert that where there is not healthy action in the body, the functions are disturbed and there is suffering. The disease may not be immediately apparent. But it will show itself. And instead of the body being charged with vital energy for the performance of all of its duties, there is lassitude and weakness. And so we find throughout the Church such a woeful state of indifference, of coldness, apathy, with occasionally some spasmodic activity produced as by a galvanic shock. There is an absence of sound spiritual health.

The great need then is the health of the spiritual Body, pulsating with the life of the Son of God, giving life to every one of its members, and each member yielding that service for which God by His spiritual gifts qualifies it. This life will overcome and destroy death. Without any outward force there will be a hearty response to the Lord's call for all the work of the Church. The office of the ministry will never be without worthy men; for the Body needing ministers, the members will yield themselves to the divine call. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power."

T. W. KRETSCHMANN.

Philadelphia, Pa.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## ARTICLE XII.

### ARE WE JUSTIFIED IN DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN AN ALTERED AND AN UNALTERED AUGUSTANA AS THE CONFESSION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH?<sup>1</sup>

This is to be a purely historical treatise. It is my intention to show how the Lutheran church gradually became conscious of such a distinction, and then we want to trace through the history of our church the elements that have supported this distinction up to this day. But before we can, in the second part of this discourse, begin with examining the developments which have led to speak of a Variata and an Invariata we must pave our way by treating

#### I. OF THE DIFFERENT EDITIONS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION PREPARED BY MELANCHTHON.

1. *Melanchthon's first editions.* Soon after the public reading of the Augustana on 25th of June, 1530, Emperor Charles V. forbade a publication of the document.<sup>2</sup> But while the Diet was yet in session there appeared not less than six prints of the German and one of the Latin text of the Confession—all without indication as to who had been the publisher or where it had been printed.<sup>3</sup> These *Ante-Melanchthon* editions were corrupted by so many typographical errors, omissions, etc., that Melanchthon considered this a sufficient excuse for disobeying the wish of the Emperor. So he published a Latin text of the Augustana that was "revised and amended," and for the preparation of it he used a "copy of

<sup>1</sup>A paper read before the Luther Club in Springfield, Ohio.

<sup>2</sup>Corp. Ref. XXVI, 219; II, 431; II, 143. Weber, *Kritische Geschichte der Augsb. Konf.* I, 156-158.

<sup>3</sup>For a description of these texts see Corp. Ref. XXVI, 477 et seqq. G. G. Weber, *Kritische Geschichte der Augsb. Konfession* I., 394 et seqq. Zoeckler, *Die Augsb. Konf.*, p. 31.



good credit." This was the so-called Editio princeps which together with the Apology appeared 1830.<sup>4</sup> And right here it may be mentioned that this first Latin edition of Melancthon is the same text that we have to-day in the Book of Concord and which is translated into English for the use of Lutheranism in America.

Now comes the interesting question: Does this Editio princeps correspond with the original Latin text delivered to the Emperor at Augsburg? It has to be admitted as a fact that both copies, the Latin as well as the German, are not known to exist any more. We know that after the reading of the Augustana on that memorable afternoon the Emperor took the Latin copy to himself and gave the German to the Archbishop of Mayence to be preserved in the Imperial archives of that city. But both copies are lost. The *German* was sent to Dr. Eck in 1540 when he wished to compare it with Melancthon's Variata which had just been issued, and it has never been returned.<sup>5</sup> It may yet exist in some archive in Italy. Prof. v. Hase has hunted in vain for it in the library of the Vatican. The *Latin* copy was deposited by the Emperor in Brussels. But when later his son, King Philip II. of Spain, heard of it, he ordered Duke Alva to bring with him the confession to Spain "in order that they (the Protestants) might not hold it as a Koran," and "to be careful that the original be given him, and not a copy, and that no other, not even a trace of it, be left, so that so pernicious a book may be forever destroyed." We know that when Alva returned to Spain, in 1573, he took the Confession with him, which has, no doubt, been destroyed.<sup>6</sup>

Yet although we do not have these original copies we are nevertheless in the position to ascertain with a high de-

<sup>4</sup>Given in the Corp. Ref. XXVII., 259. Respecting the exact time when it first appeared compare Kolde, Historische Einleitung to Mueller's Symbolische Buecher, p. xxi; also Kolde, Neue Augustana Studien, p. 729 et seqq. P. Tschackert, Die unveraenderte Augsb. Konf., p. 3. Dr. Richard, Confessional History, p. 213; also in Lutheran Quarterly, Oct., 1907, p. 435.

<sup>5</sup>Weber, Introduction to Krit. Gesch. II. Kolde, Historische Einleitung XXX. Compare Koellner Symbolik, pgg. 314-21.

<sup>6</sup>Comp. Kolde, Hist. Einleit. XXXI; Neue Augustanastudien, pp. 743 et seqq. Richard ut supra pp. 209 et seqq.

gree of certainty the relation of the Editio princeps to the Latin original. When the Augsburg Confession was in process of preparation and especially when it was about completed then there were copies taken from it by the different parties interested. There are yet 39 of these copies in existence, some of them taken when the Confession was yet very incomplete, some after completion, with even the signatures affixed, a class of manuscripts regarded especially reliable. From the Latin text in its completed form we have six copies and one French translation. Now Prof. Tschackert, of the University at Goettingen has done us a great service in publishing a book in which he, by careful comparison of all those manuscripts, has created a text, German and Latin, side by side, from which the original and lost copies cannot have differed very materially.<sup>7</sup> With the aid of this book it is now easy to make comparison with the textus receptus in the Book of Concord.

If we now make such comparisons then we soon find that already in this first Latin edition Melancthon has made changes from the original. Only two of some importance may be mentioned. In Article XIII the rejection of those who teach that the sacraments work *ex opere operato* are not in the original, it closed with the word *ostenduntur*. Melancthon has added this important passage in his first edition for print in the Editio princeps. In Article XVIII the original closed with *homicidium*, and Melancthon added the words following which we now would not like to miss in our confession, namely: *damnant Pelagianos et alios*, etc.<sup>8</sup> These words do not alter or correct the meaning of the original, but they contain some very important confessional substance.

The changes which Melancthon made in the *German* text of his first edition are even much more radical. They are very many. Articles XX, XXII and XXVIII are almost new articles. Articles IV, XIII, XVIII and others read al-

<sup>7</sup>P. Tschackert, Die unveraenderte Augsbuergische Konfession, deutsch und lateinisch, nach den besten Handschriften aus dem Besitze der Unterzeichner. Leipzig, 1901. See also Tschackert, Entsehung der luth. und reformierten Kirchenlehre, p. 288.

<sup>8</sup>Comp. Tschackert ut supra, p. 103.



together different. This first German edition of Melanchthon which he issues together with the Latin text, must be considered, as Prof. Tschackert puts it, "a private work of Melanchthon."<sup>9</sup> The variations from the contents of the Latin Editio princeps are so extensive that later the composers of the Book of Concord looked for another German text.<sup>10</sup>

Soon a second Latin edition became necessary which appeared 1531.<sup>11</sup> It was issued in octavo form while the preceding had been quarto. This edition did not have the German text with it. The Latin Apology accompanied this edition of the Augustana. Here again we have changes. It is of interest to know that it was this second Latin edition of the Augustana that was first taken into the Book of Concord, because the princeps was not accessible at the time.\* Selnecker substituted the Editio princeps for it, however, when he prepared the second edition of the Book of Concord in 1584.<sup>12</sup>

The year of 1533 brought a new German edition in octavo. Even in the long title<sup>13</sup> Melanchthon announces that he has diligently tried to improve the text ("mit vleis emendirt"). The changes are very many.

But concerning all these editions we must emphasize with Prof. Kolde that they contain no alterations of doctrinal importance; the changes have been made merely in the interest of emphasis and clearness.<sup>14</sup>

2. *The Variata*. We shall now treat of Melanchthon's edition of 1540, the one that alone is meant when there is

<sup>9</sup>See Tschackert p. 1.

<sup>10</sup>In their choice, however, they were deceived by the managers of the archives in Mayence, and also by G. Coelestin, court preacher of Brandenburg, who, when he was sent to take a copy of the original, brought back a text which two hundred years later by the thorough investigations of G. G. Weber, in his "Kritische Geschichte der Augsbургischen Konfession" was proved to be a copy of minor value, prepared at a time when the work of Melanchthon was not quite completed. It is this text which we Germans have in the Book of Concord. Koellner, Symbolik, p. 270, note 3; p. 299, note 7. Zoeckler, Augsburgische Konfession, p. 59. Kolde Hist. Einl., p. xxxi. Weber I, 236 et seqq.

<sup>11</sup>Weber, Krit. Gesch., II, pp. 68-91.

\*Selnecker Portfolio.

<sup>12</sup>Kolde, Hist. Einl. p. xxxii. Richard, Confessional History, p. 217-19.

<sup>13</sup>See Dr. Richard, Conf. Hist., p. 219.

<sup>14</sup>Hist. Einl., p. xxiii.

spoken of the Variata in contrast to the Invariata.<sup>15</sup> It is published in Latin only. The text is found in the Corpus Reformatum XXVI, 343; also in Kolde's little book "Die Augs. Konf."; translated into English in Dr. Jacobs' Book of Concord. It is a document that claims to be authoritative in a special sense. While in the long title<sup>16</sup> the Apology is announced to have been revised, nothing is said of the Augustana. The impression is made as if this edition of the Augustana is simply a reprint of the Editio princeps, the introduction telling of those unauthorized publications which had made an authoritative edition imperative. No syllable indicates that we here have a new redaction of the Augustana. At the close the names of those who signed the Confession at Augsburg are given as before. But according to Kolde<sup>17</sup> referring to the Corpus Reformatum III, 267, Melanchthon may have been authorized to publish this Variata. At the convention held at Smalkald 1537 the theologians were commissioned once more to revise the Augustana and Apology to fortify the doctrine with arguments from Scripture and the Fathers, but to keep the Confession in harmony with the Wittenberg Concord, agreed on between Luther and the South German cities the preceding year. This may have been the initiative for Melanchthon's publication of the Variata.

Now of what kind are the changes of this edition? We can divide them into three classes: (1). The order of articles has been changed. In the first part articles XII of Repentance and XI of Confession are transposed. In the second part the first five articles have been brought into an altogether different order. (2). Several articles have been considerably enlarged, mostly, like in preceding editions for

<sup>15</sup>As we have seen from the preceding paragraph we can, strictly speaking, not call the Editio Princeps an Invariata, because this edition also contains changes from the original. Yet inasmuch as these changes are of no doctrinal importance we will be justified in using that term in contrast to an edition which does contain very significant changes. And this distinction will never disappear from the terminology of the historians on this subject, nor will the Lutheran Church ever cease to make that distinction.

<sup>16</sup>See Dr. Richard, Conf. Hist., 225.

<sup>17</sup>Hist. Einl., xxiv.



purposes of instruction and distinctness. (3). Real changes of doctrinal substance are found. Prof. Zoeckler says: "In this category we can count, in a certain measure, the long discourses in articles IV, V and XX with their emphasis upon repentance and good works in a manner characteristic of synergism and corresponding with the new edition of Melanchthon's Loci of 1535. Also, prompted by the same interest, the milder interpretation of some expressions in article XVIII concerning Free Will.<sup>18</sup> Kolde agrees with Zoeckler. He also sees in the emphasis on repentance and good works in articles V and XX Melanchthon's inclination to synergism; he observes the same tendency in article XVIII, if taken together with the position of Melanchthon in the editions of his Loci since 1535.<sup>19</sup> This would agree with the following remark of Seeberg in his History of Doctrines: "There are two points in which Melanchthon consciously deviates from the doctrinal standpoint of Luther: In the doctrine of Free Will and in that of the Lord's Supper."<sup>20</sup>

The alterations in article X of the Lord's Supper are especially familiar to us. We will receive an impression of the changes by a parallel exhibition of the two texts of the article with the omitted phrases of the Invariata in italics.<sup>21</sup>

Two very important phrases of this very short article are omitted in this edition of 1540: the "*vere adsint*" (truly present) and the "*improbant secus docentes*" (we disapprove of those who teach otherwise). We do not want to say that the phraseology clearly expresses a new doctrine of the Lord's Supper. And it must be remembered that no such changes were made in the German editions in use with the Latin Va-

<sup>18</sup>Zoeckler, Die Augsb. Konf., p. 37.

<sup>19</sup>Kolde, Hist. Einl. xxv. Realencyclopaedie II, 249. Compare also Tsackert, Entstehung, etc., p. 291.

<sup>20</sup>Seeberg, Dogmengeschichte II, 336.

<sup>21</sup>It is well to remember right here that according to the exhibition of Prof. Tsackert this tenth article of the Editio princeps agrees in every matter with the original Latin copy delivered at Augsburg.

<p>Invariata.</p> <p>De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi <i>vere adsint</i> et distribuuntur vescentibus in coena Domini, et <i>improbant secus docentes</i>.</p>	<p>Variata.</p> <p>De coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini.</p>
--	---

riata; also that the Apology which accompanied this Variata text of the Confession had the same reading which it had when it appeared in 1531 in the Editio princeps.

But is this sufficient proof that those two very characteristic omissions had no doctrinal significance whatever? To arrive at a right conclusion a number of things must be considered. Remember that the Latin text of the Variata was the text for the theologians, and this was the text which Melanchthon changed. Remember also the situation at just that time. The South Germans under the leadership of Butzer, who had always been on the side of the Zwinglians, had come to an agreement with Luther on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, and it looked as if even the Zwinglians might by and by fall in line. The doctrinal formula on the basis of which the agreement took place was *mildly* Lutheran. And now let us recall that at Smalkald, 1537, the theologians were commissioned to revise the Augustana in a manner as not to conflict with the Wittenberg Concord.<sup>22</sup> Melanchthon was naturally the one to undertake this task. And in addition to this take a fact that was not generally known among the Lutherans yet, namely that Melanchthon was not any more a disinterested party in this matter. His views had undergone a change. It is very interesting to trace the gradual change of conviction in Luther's co-laborer. When he wrote the Augsburg Confession in 1530 at the Diet he was decidedly opposed to the Zwinglians. He put in the "*vere adsint*" which was very objectionable to them and thus compelled the Zwinglians, and even the South German cities, who wanted to mediate between both sides, to hand in to the Emperor their own confessions. So outspoken he is against the Zwinglians that he calls their doctrines "*dogmata intolerabilia*."<sup>23</sup> He is not willing to yield an inch, for instance, to Philip of Hessa, who was anxious to have the words "*improbant secus docentes*" eliminated. The situation at 1530 has sometimes been made to account for this attitude of Melanchthon against the Swiss

<sup>22</sup>Corp. Ref. III, 267.

<sup>23</sup>Corp. Ref. II, 25, 104, 382, etc.



and their friends. He wanted to win the favor of the Emperor to whom Zwingli with his rebellious notions was especially offensive. But that the attitude of Melanchthon was at the same time a true expression of his inmost convictions this we can see from his remarks against the Zwinglians at the time of the Marburg Colloquy which had taken place just a year ago. He is, at this time, in the doctrine of the Sacraments, completely under the influence of the powerful Luther. But gradually his views begin to change; not that he adopts another doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but he loses the appreciation of the difference between Luther and his opponents. The changing situation is a supporter of this process of development within him. If he had hoped, when writing the Augustana, that an agreement with the Roman Church might yet be possible, this hope was completely abandoned after the fruitless attempts at reconciliation which followed the delivery of the Confession.<sup>24</sup> And Melanchthon's Apology had victoriously sealed the defeat of the Roman Catholic theology. There was now no cause any more to fear the approaches from the Zwinglians. Furthermore, with the death of Zwingli in the battle at Cappel (1531) the danger for an invasion of Zwinglianism into Germany seemed to be gone. *Now the diplomatic trait in Melanchthon awakens again.* How fine if all German Protestants could be united by adopting a type of mild Lutheranism! Butzer of Strassburg in his untiring efforts to bring about a union between the Lutheran and Reformed succeeded in arranging a conference between Luther and the theologians of the South German cities. At a preliminary conference held in Cassel (1535) Melanchthon feels constrained to say that he can not represent Luther's very realistic conception of oral manducation except as a "nuntius alienae sententiae"<sup>25</sup> From the Dialogue of Oecolampadius he learns that the symbolical conception of the Lord's Supper has had its supporters among the church fathers. This makes an impression on him and he speaks of

<sup>24</sup>Dr. Richard "Confessional History," chapters x and xi.  
<sup>25</sup>Corp. Ref. II, 322.

it to Luther.<sup>26</sup> He is constantly approaching Butzer and his Zwinglian friends, and more and more he dislikes the theology with which Luther endeavors to establish the doctrine of the Real Presence.<sup>27</sup> The conviction is growing upon him that with Calvin's doctrine of a *spiritual* presence of the Lord in the Eucharist nothing essential is sacrificed. Not that he for himself rejects the Lutheran doctrine, but he loses the appreciation of the difference.<sup>28</sup> He is building bridges in the hope of a united German Protestantism.

This is the point of view from which we must try to understand this tenth article of the Variata. It does not introduce a new doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is the Lutheran doctrine, but as far as the difference with the Zwinglians is concerned, more mildly expressed than in the original or in the Editio princeps. We can agree with Prof. Kolde in Erlangen when he says: "Melanchthon wanted to secure for himself and others a basis on which to co-operate with the Swiss theologians."<sup>29</sup> Also with Planck, an outspoken Melanchthonian, when he says: "Melanchthon made these changes in order to make it possible for the Reformed to accept the Augsburg Confession without sacrificing their doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This can not be denied; it should never have been denied."<sup>30</sup> This is not disproved by Melanchthon's own words at the convention of Regensburg (1541): that he had changed nothing in substance, but had simply employed some milder terms.<sup>31</sup> To this Kolde makes the remark: "In the opinion that he had not changed anything he may have deceived himself which has happened to him quite often."<sup>32</sup>

*In the Variata we have the unconscious, embryonic beginnings of a theology which in the soon following Crypto-Calvin-*

<sup>26</sup>Corp. Ref. II, 217.

<sup>27</sup>Corp. Ref. II, 824, 837, 841; III, 292; VII, 780, 884; VIII, 353; IX, 387, 962, 963.

<sup>28</sup>Comp. Kurtz's Kirchengeschichte (14. Ed.) § 161, 9. See Schaff's Creeds of Christendom I, 240.

<sup>29</sup>Historische Einleitung to Mueller's Symbolical Books, XXVI.  
<sup>30</sup>Planck, Geschichte der Entstehung des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs IV, Book 1, pp. 12, 14.

<sup>31</sup>Corp. Ref. IV, 43.

<sup>32</sup>Die Augsb. Konfession, p. 13.



istic troubles became the fermenting element and which in a following age received a temporary expression in Syncretism, and finally became permanently embodied in the Prussian Union established in 1817. And insignificant as the changes may have appeared at first, in connection with the soon following aggressive advances of Crypto-Calvinism with the *Variata* as its shibboleth, this altered edition of Melanchthon was bound to become discredited in the Lutheran Church. This leads us to the second part of our discourse where we shall try to trace the origin and the development of a distinction between an altered and an unaltered Augsb. Conf. through the history of our church.

## II. VARIATA AND INVARIATA IN THE HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

1. *At first the Variata is not suspected.* From what we have learned of Melanchthon's habit to make changes in every new edition, of the efforts at reconciliation with the Zwinglians since the Wittenberg Concord, we can understand that these changes in article X did not especially alarm. The leaving out of the *disapproval of those who teach otherwise* was not likely to invite protest during those years after the agreement on the Wittenberg Concord, a time in which even Luther was trying to win his Swiss opponents by kindness. For the expression "truly present" (*vere adsint*) other words were employed, less distinct it is true, but which after all can be interpreted as expressing the doctrine of the Real Presence. Melanchthon's personal aversion against Luther's realism, his growing attitude of indifferentism as to the distinguishing element between Luther and Calvin in this doctrine were not yet generally known. We must remember that it was the time of his first steps in this direction.

The question as to Luther's attitude to the *Variata* has often been argued. Kurtz in his Church History quotes him to have expressed his disapproval with these words: "Philippe, you do not right in so often changing the Augsburg Confession, for it is not yours, but the church's book." But we cannot prove this utterance of Luther to be historical.

It was for the first time quoted by Flacius in his debate with Strigel at Weimer, 1560. His authority was Balthasar Winter, of Jena, who again claimed to have heard it from Magister Rorarius. Of course, such hearsay authority is not sufficient proof.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand it has been asserted that Melanchthon made these changes in article X with Luther's expressed approval. But neither is there any proof for this. Mart. Chemnitz mentions it, but he has only heard it from Melanchthon's son-in-law, Dr. Peucer, who was no impartial witness. Also Selnecker mentions it in one book, but in another he takes it back again.<sup>34</sup> So we see, it is on both sides nothing but suppositions which are colored according to the theological standpoints of the individual writers. "Neither the one nor the other can be proved with certainty by letters of Luther or by other reliable utterances of contemporaries" (Kolde).<sup>35</sup>

Brentz is known as one who watched jealously over pure Lutheran doctrine, but he praised the *Variata* highly. He wrote to Veit Dietrich: "I like to compare this last edition with the former editions. I find that much is changed, but I know that Philippus does not change anything thoughtlessly. If I think over the reasons for these changes, then it is re-

<sup>33</sup>It was interesting for me to find that even such a strictly Lutheran work as Meusel's Kirchliches Handlexikon admits this. Vol. V., 663. For a special study of this question, I refer to the following literature: Koellner, Symbolik I, 237. Disputatio inter M. Flacium Illyr. et V. Strigelium, p. 127. Historie des Bekenntnisstreits, p. 306. Hutter, Concordia concurs, p. 374.

<sup>34</sup>Chemnitz, Judicio de controversiis, etc., p. 7. Selnecker, Catalogus concilium, p. 97. Idem, Historie des Sakramentsstreits.

<sup>35</sup>We could imagine that Luther would have consented to the employment of the *exhibeantur*, because this term was also in the Wittenberg Concord, agreed upon between Luther and the South Germans, but we cannot think that he should have in any way been in favor of omitting the *vere adsint*. Considering the fact that he chose the strongest expression possible regarding the Real Presence in the Smalkald Articles, 1537. ("dass Brot und Wein im Abendmahl sei der wahrhaftig Leib und Blut Christi," comp. Realencyclopaedie, XVII., p. 643, so also in his Larger Confession of the Lord's Supper which appeared at this time), then it seems almost unthinkable that the omission of that very important phrase should have had his endorsement. Kolde says: "As we know Luther we are compelled to believe that he did not like the change which Melanchthon made, but as with so many other things he let it go." (Historische Einleitung, p. xxvi.) The absence of proof for his protest, of course, does not prove that he in no way disapproved of the changing. Luther certainly said much to Melanchthon and others of which we have no record. But we know that he did not protest against the changing in the *Variata publicly* and so must have been willing to let it go.



markable what fruit I derive out of such reading."<sup>36</sup> With these words, however, Brentz may have thought not so much of Art. X, but mainly of the many passages in the Variata by which the doctrine of justification is made clearer and has been more established by Scripture. And we always have to remember that Melancthon was, at this time, considered to be in perfect harmony with Luther, so that a man like Brentz might have been entirely without suspicion concerning the changes in Art. X. And yet, scrutinizing this remark of Brentz, may it not be possible that his very words as we quoted them ("I find that much is changed, but I know that Phil. does not change anything thoughtlessly") show an inclination to defend Melancthon in a matter which might offer ground for criticism? But it is also possible that there was no criticism whatever in the mind of Brentz and others who read the Variata. As has been mentioned before, it was the period in the history of the Reformation in which there was much good will of the Lutherans to the Zwinglians, in the hope that they would gradually adopt the Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper. As has been mentioned before, Luther himself wanted to rest the weapons of warfare against his former opponents. Let us quote from a letter which he, under the date of December 1st, 1537, wrote to the followers of Zwingli. It was an answer to a letter received from them in which they had emphasized their conception of a merely spiritual presence in the Eucharist.<sup>37</sup> In this letter Luther prays to God that he might be permitted to complete the work of reconciliation begun in the Wittenberg Concord, and he asks them to work for the same end. For himself and his friends he promises that in writing and preaching they would be quiet and mild in order not to interfere with the development. And pointing to the difference in the doctrine of the sacrament he wrote: "Since we do not yet understand each other fully it is well to exercise mutual kindness and always

<sup>36</sup>Corp. Ref. IV, 727.

<sup>37</sup>The letter of the Swiss in Hospinian II, p. 151; and in Enders Briefwechsel XI, p. 157 et sqq. Luther's answer (Latin) in the same book, p. 157; German in the Historie des Sakraments-streits, p. 400; Enders XI, 294; Erl. Ed. of Luther's Works 55, p. 190, No. 563. Extracts of both letters in Koestlin-Kawerau, Leben Luthers (4th Ed.), II, p. 350 and 352.

hope the best until all turbid waters have fully settled."<sup>38</sup> If we keep in mind that the publication of the Variata fell in a time of such peaceful sentiment towards the Zwinglians then much of the attitude of the Lutheran theologians to this edition of the Augustana is explained. Melancthon, in his changes of article X, acted in harmony with a universal sentiment although he certainly went farther than Luther and also Brentz would have done. To be mild in treating the Zwinglians was the general policy among the Lutherans. But this sentiment changed as soon as it became evident that they who now accepted Calvin as their leader determinedly rejected the Real Presence. Now the changes in Art. X, as was felt later, stood there as an unfortunate concession which, in the interest of a genuine Lutheranism, had to be disclaimed. And by the time this came to be felt, the friendly relations of Melancthon to Calvin and to Butzer who more and more leaned to the views of Calvin, gave ground for the suspicion that Melancthon had made those changes in Art. X of the Variata with the intention of creating a platform which would be acceptable to the opponents of the doctrine of the Real Presence.

2. *The Catholics are the first to notice the difference between Variata and Invariata.* Emperor Charles V, in his endeavors to lead the Lutherans back to the Catholic church, arranged for a colloquy between Lutherans and Catholics which was to be held in the fall of 1540 in Worms.<sup>39</sup> The negotiations were to be conducted on the basis of Augustana, Apology and Smalcald Articles. Here the Lutherans handed to the chairman of the conference the German edition of 1540 (which agrees almost to the word with the German edition of 1533) and the Latin Variata of 1540.<sup>40</sup> But Dr. Eck had procured for himself the German original from the archives of Mayence, and now protested against the Latin Variata with special reference to the omission of the "*vere adsint*" in Art. X. What

<sup>38</sup>Comp. Planck III, Book 8, p. 399 sqq. But for correction in some points see Koestlin-Kawerau, Leben Luthers II, 349 sqq.

<sup>39</sup>Kurtz, Church History, §137,2.

<sup>40</sup>Comp. Weber II, 320 sqq. Richard, Melancthon and the Augsburg Confession, p. 61; Confessional History, p. 246.



he objected to in the new edition were the terms that did not admit of interpreting the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence as identical with the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation.<sup>41</sup>

Another colloquy for the same purpose was held at Regensburg, 1542.<sup>42</sup> Did the Lutherans here use the Variata or one of the first editions? I have studied and gone into correspondence with specialists in Germany on this question, but have not been able to secure satisfactory information. Zoeckler says that it was the Invariata and he insists that Calvin who was present here as a delegate from Strasburg also subscribed the Invariata, but from the sources which he quotes it cannot be confirmed. True, the Lutherans there declared with emphasis that "they embrace the Confession which was delivered to His Imperial Majesty at Augsburg," and concerning the Lord's Supper they profess the doctrine according to which "body and blood of Christ under the bread and wine are truly present and received by the communicants."<sup>43</sup> But while this is proof that the Lutherans wanted to stand by their doctrine of the Real Presence, it does not settle the question as to the edition and copy of the Confession that was used at that colloquy. The fact is that at Regensburg the Augsb. Confession was not made the basis of the negotiations like at Worms, but a document prepared by order of the Emperor.<sup>44</sup> But what copy of the Confession was used for reference does not appear from the sources. The probability is that it was not one of the first editions, because the latest edition, the Variata, was introduced into all the

<sup>41</sup>Those who take the position that the changes in Art. X have no significance in the direction of an approach to the Butzer-Swiss type of theology always emphasize that Melancthon made the changes in order to do away with the possibility of interpreting the article in the sense of Transubstantiation. But they overlook that the "truly present" could very well have been kept, together with a qualification of that important phrase such as "in, with and under," which would have eliminated the idea of Transubstantiation and would at the same time have expressed the genuine Lutheran position with the distinctness of the original. And it is the omission of the "truly present" together with the phrase "they disapprove of those who teach otherwise" that gives cause for suspicion.

<sup>42</sup>Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte, §137,3.

<sup>43</sup>Zoeckler, ut supra, p. 41. Richard, p. 247.

<sup>44</sup>See Corp. Ref. IV, 92, and Weber Krit. Geschichte II, 373.

schools, and the Lutherans were not conscious of a material difference between former and later editions. Like to-day a new edition of a book is preferred to an older edition, so the latest edition of the Augustana was given preference to former editions. Yea the older editions were soon forgotten so that they could hardly be procured.

In 1555 the Augsburg Religious Peace Treaty was concluded which secured peace for the Protestant dominions on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. But King Ferdinand wanted to make one more attempt to unite the Lutherans with the Catholic Church. So he arranged for a colloquy at Worms, in 1557, the last official attempt of this kind between these two churches.<sup>45</sup> Here it came to scandalous occurrences. The Catholics, among them the Jesuit Canisius, demanded with malice and cunning that first of all those Lutherans who had deserted the Augsburg Confession — he meant the Melancthonians — should be condemned. And this was water on the mill of the Flacianists who had planned to leave the meeting ostentatiously in order that Philippism might "not merely be punctured, but its neck be broken altogether," as Flacius had expressed himself.<sup>46</sup> There were painful incidents, and it served the Catholics to a "malicious satisfaction." Canisius spoke of a pure and an adulterated Augsburg Confession.<sup>47</sup> But we observe that it is the Catholics only who distinguished between an altered and unaltered Augsb. Confession. One wonders that the Flacianists, here at Worms, who accused the Melancthonians of having deserted the teachings of the Augsburg Confession, did not at the same time denounce the Variata. But no word of it yet among the Lutherans. Evidently the distinction between a Variata and Invariata was not yet current among them.

To heal the rupture that was threatening Lutheranism was the task of the Frankfurt Diet, the following year, 1558.<sup>48</sup> It is of interest to observe that in the resolutions of this con-

<sup>45</sup>Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte (13th ed.), §140,1.

<sup>46</sup>Realencyclopaedie VI, 169.

<sup>47</sup>Realencyclopaedie XII, 525. Kolde, Historische Einleitung, p. xxvii. Salis Historie der Augsb. Conf. III, 308.

<sup>48</sup>Kurtz, §144,11.



vention drawn by Melanchthon, there is no endeavor to defend the Variata against an assertion that it differs from the original. The resolutions declare that all are harmonious in doctrine on the basis of the Confession which is everywhere in use, and of which all seem to believe that it materially agrees with the Confession delivered at Augsburg. And stronger proof yet that the distinction was not yet current: Flacius wrote two fulminating pamphlets against this "Samaritan Interim"<sup>49</sup> and the strictly Lutheran Duke Frederick of Weimar ordered his theologians to write the "Confutation Book" against the resolutions of the Frankfort Diet,<sup>50</sup> but in none of these three writings against Melanchthonianism is there any rejection of the Variata as a document.

3. *The first discussion of the difference between Variata and Invariata among the Lutherans themselves.*

In 1560 a disputation was held in Weimar between Victor Strigel and Matth. Flacius.<sup>51</sup> The subject was the doctrine of Free Will. Strigel had called Flacius an enemy of the Augsburg Confession. In the disputation, ordered by Duke John Frederick, Strigel frequently referred to the Augustana in the form it was known and in use. And indeed there is not only concerning the Lord's Supper, but also on this subject of Free Will a remarkable difference between the Editio princeps on the one hand and the Variata on the other. Prof. Tschackert in his excellent work which has just come from the press points out some striking deviations of the Variata from the Invariata. In Art. V of the Confession where the Invariata reads: "Through Word and Sacrament . . . the Holy Spirit is given," there the Variata says: "When we comfort ourselves (erigimus nos) through faith, then simultaneously (simul) the Holy Spirit is given us." Again in Art. V the Variata has this sentence: "When we hear or consider the Gospel, or use the sacraments and comfort ourselves (nos consolamur) through faith, then simultaneously (simul) the Holy Ghost is working." Note the repeated use

<sup>49</sup>Preger, Matth. Flacius, p. 74 sqq.

<sup>50</sup>Published in Heppe I, Additions 86 et sqq. Also Corp. Ref. IX, 489 et sqq.

<sup>51</sup>See account of it in Kurtz, §144,131, and Richard, p. 358.

of the word "simul." In Art. XVIII of Free Will the Invariata says that "spiritual righteousness is worked by the Holy Ghost who is received in the hearts through the Word of God." Here the Variata says: "But spiritual righteousness is effected in us when we are assisted (adjuvamus) by the Holy Spirit. This same word "adjuvari" is also put into Article XX.<sup>52</sup> So Melanchthon after changing his conviction concerning Free Will "put his own private theology into the Variata." (Tschackert.) Now here at this disputation at Weimar it was that Flacius for the first time insisted on a material difference between Melanchthon's later and former editions of the Augustana, and here it was where he told that story of Luther's disapproving remark to Melanchthon which we refused to accept as historical, because it cannot be proved by clear testimony. But from now on the attention of the church is directed to this distinction of an altered and an unaltered Augsb. Confession. Not that the terms "Variata" and "Invariata" were coined right away, but the distinction was there and became fixed more and more in the consciousness of leading Lutheran theologians. Melanchthon had recently passed away, but his followers denied a material difference, while the Flacianists insisted that the later editions of the Augsb. Confession stood for another theology. Suspicion against the Variata increased when Calvinism, favored by the Philipists, now entered upon an aggressive propaganda in Germany with constant appealing to the text of the Variata. Calvin himself, in a public reply to Joachim Westphal, declared that he could accept the Augsburg Confession *in the way it has been interpreted by its own author*, and he stated that in 1541 both Melanchthon and Cruciger had expressed themselves as

<sup>52</sup>These observations by Tschackert in his new work "Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre," Goettingen, p. 291. He says, the mistake of Melanchthon was a certain co-ordination of the human and divine factor in conversion "which in religion is always a mistake, because the human must ever remain dependent upon God." (ibid.) And he adds on page 292: "Abschwächung der Lehren der ursprünglichen Konfession, das ist die Gesamttenenz der Variata überhaupt." Weakening the teachings of the original Confession is the leading tendency of the Variata.



being in entire harmony with his (Calvin's) doctrine of the Sacrament.<sup>53</sup>

Now we come to another occasion of a public discussion of the subject. In 1561 all Protestant princes of Germany assembled at *Naumburg*. (*Fuerstentag zu Naumburg*). Their aim was to decide on a confessional basis for Lutheranism in order to present a united front against Rome at the council of Trent which was to be resumed again and where they might be invited to attend. It was a convention of princes only, theologians not being expected to participate. The interests represented were somewhat conflicting. The Elector Frederick Palatine, who soon afterward went over to Calvinism, hoped that the *Variata* of 1540 would be chosen for subscription especially because this edition did not exclude Calvin's conception of the sacrament. His father-in-law, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, a very strict Lutheran, wanted the edition of 1530 and with it the Apology and Luther's Smalcald Articles. Elector August of Saxony had introduced into his dominion the *Variata*, but had no special objection to the edition of 1530 inasmuch as he considered both as actually agreeing with each other. He thought that the *Variata* in every respect taught the doctrines of the *Editio princeps*. Much time was spent at the convention with comparing the several editions of the Confession, with growing surprise over the many variations. Finally the princes agreed to subscribe the octavo edition of 1531. The reason for this was that the Apology accompanying this second edition does not have in Article X the *mutato pane* of the first edition which favored the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation and was especially objectionable to Elector Frederick Palatine.<sup>54</sup> And as a further concession to Frederick who had wanted the *Variata*, and also to Elector August who had incorporated the *Variata* in the *Corpus doctrinae Philippicum*, they declared in a "Pre-

<sup>53</sup>Salig, *Historie der Augsburger Konfession* I, 491. Staehelin, *Joh. Calvin* I, 234. To Martin Schalling Calvin made this remark: "Nec vero Augustanam Confessionem repudio, cui pridem volens ac libens subscripsi, sicut eam auctor ipse interpretatus est." Zoeckler, *ut supra*, p. 41.

<sup>54</sup>For further study of this question see Kawerau in *Realencyclopaedie* XIII, 665. Richard, p. 296.

face" which was to accompany the edition of 1531 that the *Variata* contained no new doctrine, but that in it simply the "Confession was repeated in a somewhat more stately and elaborate manner, explained and enlarged on the basis of the Holy Scriptures."<sup>55</sup> From this agreement at Naumburg which soon afterward broke to pieces again, we can take nothing for the solution of the problem whether or not the *Variata* differs theologically from the *Invariata*. We must remember that this was a conference of laymen who simply settled an exceedingly difficult question by a compromise. Yet this convention is of interest for us since we have here, for the first time, a discussion of *Variata* and *Invariata* with reference to establishing a confessional basis for the Lutheran Church.

4. *The conviction of a difference between Variata and Invariata established by the Corpora doctrinae and the Form of Concord.*

The Lutheran churches of the different German states feeling the need of doctrinal unity at least in their own dominions, begin to establish, independent of one another, a collection of confessional writings which is declared *norma normans* for the teaching of the divine Word.<sup>56</sup> There is the *Corpus doctrinae Philippicum*. This collection issued for Electoral Saxony by the authority of the Elector contained, besides the three oecumenical creeds, only writings of Melancthon: first the *Variata* of 1540-42; then the briefer edition of 1531; then followed the Apology, the *Confessio Saxonica*, the *Loci* (ed. 1556), the *Examen ordinandorum* (1552), and several other documents prepared by Melancthon. In Pomerania a *Corpus doctrinae* was adopted which added to those writings of Melancthon the Catechisms of Luther and the Smalcald Articles. Other states again, as a demonstration against Melancthonianism, omitted the *Variata* and adopted the *Editio princeps*. So, for instance, Brunswick in 1561. The *Corpus doctrinae Brandenburgicum* of 1572 claimed to have the Augsb. Confession "aus dem rechten Original." This recalls the mission of G. Coelestine to Mayence

<sup>55</sup>Richard, 298.

<sup>56</sup>Comp. article of Kawerau in *Realencyclopaedie* IV, 293-298.



of which we have before spoken.<sup>57</sup> Strictly Lutheran in their composition were the *Corpora doctrinae* of Prussia (1567), of Brunswick-Wolfenbuettel (1570), of Thuringia (1570), and of Brunswick-Lueneburg (1576). These all contained the *Editio princeps* instead of the *Variata*.

After 1552 Calvinism had entered upon an active propaganda in Germany. In Electoral Saxony the Melanchthonians appealing to and favoring the text of the *Variata* worked into its hands. They almost succeeded in delivering the whole country over to Calvinism. Nothing contributed more to setting Lutheranism against the *Variata* than these machinations of the Melanchthonians in Saxony. It was this experience with Crypto-Calvinism that finally made Elector August of Saxony willing to participate in the work of creating the Form of Concord. And when in 1580 the Book of Concord was published there was universal agreement in adopting the first edition of the Augustana instead of the *Variata*. (By mistake they first put in the second edition (Latin) for which later Selnecker substituted the *Editio princeps*. Respecting the German text they fell victims of Coelestin's deception and put in a text dating from a time when the Augsburg Confession was not quite ready for delivery. While this is interesting for the historian nothing can be derived from it against the *Invariata* and in favor of the *Variata*. Neither the second edition of the Latin text nor this German text contains deviations from the original that are of doctrinal importance as is the case with the *Variata* editions since 1540.

5. *The Variata as a special key for the Reformed to secure the benefits of the Augsburg Peace Treaty.*

This leads us to an observation that has also contributed to fix the character of the *Variata* in the judgment of the Lutheran Church. Remember: only the adherents to the Augsb. Confession were to enjoy the peace and tolerance promised by the Treaty of 1555. The Reformed were not included. They could come in and find shelter under that

<sup>57</sup>Comp. Kolde Hist. Einleitung, XXXI.

peace treaty only as adherents to the Augsb. Confession. But they could accept the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper no more now than they could in 1530. So the text of the *Variata* was used by them as a special key for obtaining this desired shelter. We have seen that Calvin could subscribe the Augustana as interpreted by the *Variata*. And there were, especially in Germany, so many shades of Reformed churches, not Calvinistic in the doctrine of Predestination, but holding to Calvin's conception of the Lord's Supper. If it had not been for the *Variata* or let us say: if the text of Art. X of this edition had not permitted of a Calvinistic interpretation, these German-Reformed churches would not have been able to maintain themselves as entitled to toleration in those years before the outbreak of the Thirty Year's War when the Jesuits in every possible way tried to magnify every departure from the Augsburg Confession as a violation of the terms of the Augsburg Peace Treaty.<sup>58</sup> In passing let me remark that in 1569 the Catholic Emperor Maximilian II took steps to investigate concerning the original copy of the Augsb. Confession.<sup>59</sup> But this fact that the Reformed considered themselves entitled to the benefits of the Augsb. Peace Treaty by appealing to the *Variata* naturally added to stamp this document as ambiguous in character regarding a doctrine in which Lutheranism always has been specially sensitive.

6. *Variata and Invariata in the attempts at a union between Lutherans and Reformed.*

While the furies of the Thirty Years' War were raging and Catholicism employed all its power in the effort to wipe out Protestantism, several attempts were made to unite Lutherans and German Reformed. In 1631 a colloquy was held at Leipzig between prominent theologians of both parties.<sup>60</sup> The Hessian theologians Crocius and Neuberger together with the Brandenburgian court preacher Berg as representatives of the Reformed met here with the Leipzig professors

<sup>58</sup>Tschackert, Entstehung, etc., p. 293.

<sup>59</sup>Zoeckler, p. 67.

<sup>60</sup>Realencycl. XI, 363.



Polycarp Leyser, Henry Hoepfner and court preacher Hoe von Hoenegg in a friendly conference lasting for several days. They soon were agreed on many articles of the Augsburg Confession, but they could not agree on Art. X of the Lord's Supper, and in connection with this also not on Art. III, where the Lutherans insisted on the Lutheran conception of Christology. But what interests us especially in this connection is, that here the Reformed theologians declared the Variata as their interpretation of the Invariata, while the Lutherans required an unconditional adoption of the Invariata. Another colloquy was held in 1646 in Thorn, but with no result except that it led to the promulgation of a new Reformed Confession (*Declaratio Thorunensis*) which established itself indiscriminately on the Variata and the Invariata.<sup>61</sup> It is always the same observation: the Reformed can accept the Augsb. Confession *only as interpreted by the Variata*. Here it may also be remembered that when Elector Sigismund undertook to introduce Calvinism into Brandenburg he ordered, in a decree of 1614, that the Invariata be displaced by the Variata.<sup>62</sup> Not exactly for the purpose of uniting Lutherans and Reformed, but nevertheless in an attempt to establish a confessional basis agreeable to both churches the Palatinate of Rhine, in 1853, under the lead of Professor Ebrard (German Reformed) of Erlangen adopted the Variata of 1540. It was done with the declaration that this edition of the Confession represented the true consensus between the Augustana of 1530 and the Heidelberg Catechism. This confessional basis lasted for only a short time as it soon was overthrown by a pronounced Liberalism.<sup>63</sup> But it shows the persistency with which the adherents of the Calvinistic conception of the Lord's Supper have even up to recent times pointed to the Variata as representing in distinction from the *Editio princeps*, their view.

Now, in order to sum up, let me again ask the question expressed in the theme of this discourse: "Are we justified in

<sup>61</sup>See Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* I, 562; also Boekel, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, p. 867.

<sup>62</sup>Wangemann, *Una Sancta II*, First Book, p. 46.

<sup>63</sup>Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte*, 13th ed., §198,5.

distinguishing between an Altered and an Unaltered Augustana as the Confession of the Lutheran Church?" I answer

1. We must not permit our view to become beclouded by historians who have an axe to grind in the interest of Melancthonism; who like to tell us long stories of Melancthon's custom to make changes in all his many editions of the Augustana, changes of which they say that many of them were "essential." This was done by G. G. Weber with the purpose of diverting the attention from the edition of 1540 which alone is meant when we speak of the Altered Augsburg Confession.<sup>64</sup>

2. The Variata contains very significant changes and omissions. Whether these are an indication of a real change in Melancthon's conviction concerning the Lord's Supper is a matter of dispute, though it seems certain that Melancthon had gradually lost his former appreciation of the difference between Luther and his Swiss opponents. If we consider the historical situation in connection with the well-known diplomatic trait in Melancthon, then there can be no doubt that the changes were made for the purpose of making Art. X of the Augustana acceptable for the sympathizers with the Zwinglian view; not to sacrifice the Lutheran position, but to express it "more mildly." And it must not be overlooked that the changes of the Variata do not pertain only to Article X of the Lord's Supper, but also to Article XVIII of Free Will and to the portions of the Confession that are related to this article.<sup>65</sup>

3. The silence of Luther and the Lutherans regarding the changes in Article X must be understood out of the peculiar situation at the time when the Variata appeared, at a time when the utmost care was used by all to win the sympathizers with Zwingli over to the Lutheran Church.

<sup>64</sup>Compare the criticisms against Weber in Zoeckler, *Augsb. Conf.*, p. 79. Ukert, *Luthers Leben* I, 261. J. L. Funk, *Krit. Ausg. des deutschen Urtextes der Augsb. Conf. Introd.*, p. xii. Rudelbach, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die A. C.*, p. 106 sqq., especially p. 110.

<sup>65</sup>A masterful characterization of the Variata and of the changes in Melancthon's theology is given by Schaff in his *Creeds of Christendom* I, 240.



4. When later Calvinism entered upon an aggressive propaganda in Germany, and large parts of the Lutheran Church came to be in danger of extinction, and when it was found that the invaders made the Variata their shibboleth: then the eyes of the Lutheran Church were opened, and the significant omissions in Art. X of the Variata stood there as unhappy concessions which had to be disowned by appealing to the "Invariata" so called, the Editio princeps, an edition which, it is true also contains changes from the original, *but such as are of no consequence to the doctrinal system of our church.* For this reason the Variata could not go into the Book of Concord.

5. The importance that has ever since been attached to the Variata by the Reformed who declared that they could accept Article X of the Augsburg Confession in the form given in that edition, but not in the form of the original, would naturally revive the distinction. And so we find that many of the Lutheran churches in Germany have established themselves by adopting a form of subscription which recognizes the "Invariata."<sup>66</sup>

6. If a Lutheran body to-day places itself on the *unaltered* Augsb. Confession—as most Lutherans in America do, also the General Synod in its Hagerstown and Richmond Resolutions—it simply means to emphasize a principle,<sup>67</sup> name-

<sup>66</sup>See, for instance, the form used in the Kingdom of Saxony, adopted under the leadership of a Luthardt, Kahnis and Delitzsch; also the form of Schleswig-Holstein, which is regarded as one of the best that was ever framed. Drews Urkunde I. 37. Schleswig-Holsteinisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt, 1909, p. 582. English in Lutheran Quarterly, January, 1907, pages 90 and 82.

<sup>67</sup>This is important for appreciating the whole discussion about Variata and Invariata. If we place ourselves upon the "unaltered" Augsb. Conf. then we do not think so much of the *document* of the Variata to which we put ourselves in opposition: the edition of 1540-42, which few know and no Lutheran body to-day adopts formally; *but we think of the Melancthonian theology back of this document* (see Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, 240), a theology which labored to bridge over the difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism and which in its representatives of a later age has paved the way for a movement (the Union of 1817) that aims to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches by treating their doctrinal distinction, especially regarding the Lord's Supper, as a matter of indifference, and which in the doctrine of Free Will sacrificed essential elements of the sola gratia theology of Luther (Tschackert, *Entstehung der lutherischen und reformierten Kirchenlehre*, p. 291). Even in cases where the Variata was adopted we do not read anything of the introduction of the Variata *as an edition*. It simply meant that Art.

ly that it wants to stand on the basis of a genuine Lutheranism over against any modifications in favor of Crypto-Calvinism or Synergism.

J. L. NEVE.

Springfield, Ohio.

Hanna Divinity School (Wittenberg College),

X of the Editio princeps was to be interpreted in harmony with the phraseology of the same article of the Variata. Concerning what edition to introduce for use in church and school there can never be any discussion among us. The first Latin edition of 1530, the Editio princeps, is among all other ante-Melancthon editions the best. Historically it is the only one that we can accept. No Lutheran body in the whole world would accept any other. Taken *by itself* we would not call it "unaltered," because it also has some changes from the original; but *compared with the Variata* it deserves the name "unaltered," because concerning the doctrines in question it is outspoken and free from all ambiguity.